

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/879,098	TOMIKAWA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Thjuan K. Addy	2614	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thjuan K. Addy. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Randy Beckers. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 15 November 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 28, and 29.

Identification of prior art discussed: All cited prior art used in the previous rejection.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative argued that neither of the cited prior art used in the previous rejection disclose or suggest distribution routes, which are forced to pass through at least one redistribution server, which distributes streaming data to a plurality of clients. Applicant's representative further argued that the at least one redistribution server, which distributes streaming data to a plurality of clients, based on information pertaining to the cost, is also not disclosed or suggested by either of the cited prior art used in the previous rejection. Examiner, after further consideration, agreed with the above arguments. Applicant's representative stated that he will be officially filing the Arguments/Remarks.